

Renormalizable Non-Metric Quantum Gravity?

Kirill Krasnov

*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham,
Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK*

and

*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics,
Waterloo, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

(Dated: v2: May 15, 2006)

We argue that four-dimensional quantum gravity may be essentially renormalizable if one relaxes the assumption of metricity of the theory. We work with Plebanski formulation of general relativity in which the metric (tetrad), the connection, and the curvature are all independent variables and the usual relations among these quantities are valid only on-shell. One of the Euler-Lagrange equations of this theory ensures its metricity. We show that quantum corrected action contains a counterterm that destroys this metricity property, and that no other counterterms appear, at least, at the one-loop level. The new term in the action is akin to a curvature-dependent cosmological “constant”.

PACS numbers: 04.60.-m, 11.10.Gh, 11.15.-q

Quantum gravity is known to be non-renormalizable. However, its (non-)renormalizability properties have been explored mostly in the original Einstein-Hilbert second-order formulation. One may argue that the first-order formulation of gravity that uses tetrad instead of the metric is more fundamental as one has to employ it if gravity is to be coupled to fermions. In this formulation there arises a new independent field - the connection A^{IJ} , and the tetrad θ^I is used instead of the metric. Both A^{IJ} and θ^I are one-forms, and the indices I, J run over 0, 1, 2, 3. The action of the first order gravity is

$$S[\theta, A] = \frac{1}{8\pi G} \int_M \epsilon^{IJKL} (\theta^I \theta^J F^{KL} + \frac{\Lambda}{4} \theta^I \theta^J \theta^K \theta^L). \quad (1)$$

Here $F = dA + (1/2)[A, A]$ is the curvature of the Lorentz group Lie algebra valued spin connection A , Λ is (a multiple of) the cosmological constant, and the wedge product of all the forms is assumed. The renormalizability of quantum gravity in 2+1 dimensions is easiest to establish precisely in such first-order formulation [1]. One could therefore expect to get some new insight into the renormalization properties of 3+1 gravity by using the above action as a starting point. However, one immediately encounters a problem that there is no term in (1) quadratic in the fields that could be interpreted as kinetic. Such a term arises only if one assumes the background to be constant, which makes the usual tricks of the background field method unavailable and the whole perturbative expansion obscure. It is doubtful that such a background dependent perturbation theory could lead to any new insight.

Another formulation of general relativity was proposed by Plebanski [2]. The main idea is that, in addition to the tetrad-like and connection fields, there is a new field that on-shell becomes identified with the Weyl part of the curvature tensor. Importantly, in this formulation gravity becomes a non-metric theory - instead of the tetrad one-forms one uses certain new two-forms that become

related to the metric only on-shell. In this paper we will use the original Plebanski self-dual formulation. For Plebanski-type formulation without the self-dual split see [3]. The action of the theory is given by

$$S[B, A, \Psi] = \frac{1}{2\pi i G} \int_M B^a F^a + \frac{1}{2} (\Lambda \delta^{ab} + \Psi^{ab}) B^a B^b. \quad (2)$$

Here a, b are the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Lie algebra indices, Ψ^{ab} is a field that on-shell becomes the Weyl part of the curvature (it is required to be symmetric traceless), B^a is a Lie algebra valued 2-form field that on-shell becomes expressed through a tetrad, and $F^a(A) = dA^a + (1/2)f^{abc}A^bA^c$ is the curvature of the connection A^a , and f^{abc} are the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Lie algebra structure constants. In this self-dual formulation all fields are complex-valued, which explains the unusual factor of $1/i$ in front of the action. Certain reality conditions need to be imposed to get back to real-valued gravity of particular metric signature, see e.g. [3] for more details on this. Varying the action with respect to Ψ^{ab} one gets

$$B^a B^b = \frac{1}{3} \delta^{ab} \delta^{cd} B^c B^d, \quad (3)$$

which can be shown to imply that B^a is the self-dual part of the two form $B^{IJ} := (1/2)\epsilon^{IJKL}\theta^{[K}\theta^{L]}$ for some tetrad θ^I (there are some discrete ambiguities that we are ignoring here, see e.g. [3]). The field Ψ^{ab} thus plays the role of a Lagrange multiplier that imposes the metricity condition (3). In turn, varying the action (2) with respect to B^a one gets $F^a = -(\Lambda \delta^{ab} + \Psi^{ab})B^b$, which identifies Ψ^{ab} as the self-dual part of the Weyl curvature tensor.

In formulation (2) there is a kinetic term $B^a dA^a + (\Lambda/2)B^a B^a$ quadratic in the fields, and thus a perturbative expansion of the usual type is possible (see, however, more remarks on this below). An immediate question is then how to interpret the term containing Ψ^{ab} . In this paper we will treat the field Ψ^{ab} as an external background field, and analyze renormalizability properties of

gravity in formulation (2) in the background of a chosen Ψ^{ab} . Our analysis can thus be compared to a treatment of the Dirac electron in the background of an external electromagnetic potential. As is well-known, quantum fluctuations of the fermionic field induce a kinetic term of the usual form $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ for the electromagnetic potential. One of the aims of our analysis is to see if there is any similar effect occurring for the curvature field Ψ in the theory (2).

Before we describe the results of a detailed perturbative treatment, it is worth discussing the renormalizability of (2) by power counting. The mass dimensions of the fields are as follows. The field B^a is related to the tetrad, and is thus dimensionless, while A^a, Ψ^{ab} are the connection and (on-shell) curvature fields correspondingly and thus have $[A] = 1, [\Psi] = 2$. The dimension of the cosmological constant is $[\Lambda] = 2$. It is clear, however, that this choice of the dimensions is far from natural. The above action cries for a rescaling of the fields in which the Newton constant G is absorbed into the B, Ψ fields and Λ . The new dimensions are $[B] = 2, [\Psi] = 0, [\Lambda] = 0$. Re-written in this form, there is no dimensionfull coupling constant in the theory. Moreover, there is not even a dimensionless “gravitational” coupling constant left in the theory; in a sense, it is now the curvature field Ψ that plays the role of such coupling.

The power counting analysis is now straightforward. Ultraviolet (UV) divergences will generate all terms of mass dimension four compatible with the gauge symmetry. Because the mass dimension of the curvature field Ψ is zero, it is clear that all powers of this field will get generated. Thus, in addition to the term $\Psi^{ab}B^aB^b$ already present in (2) the terms of the form

$$\frac{1}{2}(\Psi^{k_1})^{ab}(\text{Tr}(\Psi^2))^{k_2} \dots (\text{Tr}(\Psi^n))^{k_n} B^a B^b \quad (4)$$

will have to be added to the action to absorb the arising UV divergences, each such term with its own undetermined coupling constant. The counterterms arising are thus of the type *(curvature)ⁿ* – the theory does seem to be as non-renormalizable as in the usual quantum gravity. In the usual perturbative metric-based treatment the divergences proliferate because the coupling constant of the theory – the Newton constant – has negative mass dimension. In the theory under consideration the multitude of divergences is due to the fact that there is a field of mass dimension zero.

In spite of the comforting similarities discussed above, the behavior of the two theories under renormalization is rather different, as we shall see. For the moment, let us assume that the counterterms (4) are the only ones arising – a very non-trivial assumption which we shall argue must hold for the theory under consideration (after some field redefinitions), see more on this below. It is then clear that the whole effect of the counterterms is to replace the curvature field Ψ^{ab} in (2) by a non-trivial

functional $\tilde{\Psi}^{ab}(\Psi)$ depending on many new parameters (coupling constants). Importantly, the functional $\tilde{\Psi}^{ab}$ is no longer traceless. Indeed, let us denote its trace by $\phi(\Psi) := \text{Tr}\tilde{\Psi}(\Psi)$. We can then write:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\Psi)^{ab} = \Phi^{ab}(\Psi) + \frac{1}{3}\delta^{ab}\phi(\Psi), \quad (5)$$

where $\Phi^{ab}(\Psi)$ is the traceless part of $\tilde{\Psi}$. The function $\Phi^{ab}(\Psi)$ is a complicated one, known only as an expansion in powers of Ψ (with undetermined coefficients). However, it maps a symmetric trace-free tensor Ψ^{ab} into a symmetric trace-free tensor Φ^{ab} , which appears in the renormalized action. It is therefore clear that the curvature field Ψ^{ab} is a bare, non-observable one, and that Φ^{ab} just replaces the original field Ψ^{ab} after the renormalization. We can now, at least in principle, invert the functional $\Phi^{ab}(\Psi)$ to get $\Psi^{ab} = \Psi^{ab}(\Phi)$, and substitute this into the trace function to produce a function $\phi(\Phi)$. Thus, provided the assumption we made about the divergences of the theory is correct, the effect of counterterms consists in replacing the bare curvature field Ψ by the renormalized one Φ , and in the appearance of a new “trace” term in the action. The resulting renormalized action is:

$$\frac{1}{i} \int_M B^a F^a + \frac{1}{2} \left(\Lambda \delta^{ab} + \Phi^{ab} + \frac{\delta^{ab}}{3} \phi(\Phi) \right) B^a B^b. \quad (6)$$

Before we return to the assumption made above, let us discuss the implications of the new term in the (renormalized) action. It is easy to see that the metricity equations are modified to

$$B^a B^b = \frac{1}{3} \left(\delta^{ab} - \frac{d\phi(\Phi)}{d\Phi_{ab}} \right) \delta^{cd} B^c B^d. \quad (7)$$

This equation no longer implies that the two-form field B^a is of metric (tetrad) origin. We see that non-metricity is unavoidable whenever there is non-zero “curvature” Φ . We have put the word “curvature” in the quotation marks because it is no longer true that the field Φ^{ab} is the Weyl part of the Riemann curvature for the metric determined by B^a – there is no such metric anymore. Nevertheless, we will continue to refer to Φ as the curvature field.

If the only arising counterterms are those of the type (4), the class of theories (6) is closed under the renormalization group flow. These theories are then still non-renormalizable in the strict sense of the word, as there is an infinite number of undetermined couplings – the coefficients in the expansion of $\phi(\Phi)$ into (traces of) powers of Φ – to be fixed by experiment or some other principle. However, the renormalization group flow preserving the form of the action (6) is therefore a flow in the space of one scalar function of a 3×3 symmetric traceless matrix. As there is only 2 scalar invariants that can be constructed from such a matrix (namely the traces of its

square and cube), the renormalization group acts in the space of complex-valued functions of two complex variables. Thus, in this formulation of gravity the renormalization group flow becomes much more tractable. It is in this sense that the theory can be referred to as “renormalizable”. There is then the hope that the flow can be understood completely. After this is done one would be not far from an ultraviolet (UV) completion of the theory, e.g. via the asymptotic safety scenario of Weinberg [4]. In the present case, this scenario would translate into a conjecture that there exists a non-trivial UV fixed point of the renormalization group flow given by certain function $\phi_{UV}(\Phi)$. We note also that the renormalizability properties of the theory under consideration, i.e. the renormalization group flow acting in the space of scalar functions is similar to those of symmetry-reduced gravity model studied by Niedermaier, see [5] for a review. Existence of a non-Gaussian UV fixed point in this model gives hope that the asymptotic safety scenario may also be realized in the theory (6).

To demonstrate that (6) has the properties as described above it remains to be shown that the counterterms (4) are indeed the only ones that arise. Before we discuss this any further, let us see what other counterterms could be expected. First, we should note that the statement that only (4) get generated is true only with the clause “up to field redefinitions”. Indeed, in addition to the terms we already discussed, the terms of the form $\tilde{\Psi}_{FF}^{ab}(\Psi)F^aF^b$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_{BF}^{ab}(\Psi)B^aF^b$, where $\tilde{\Psi}_{FF}(\Psi)$, $\tilde{\Psi}_{BF}(\Psi)$ are series in Ψ (which can start with the constant term proportional to δ^{ab}), are all of mass dimension four and are gauge invariant, and therefore will get generated. However, these terms are easily eliminated by a redefinition of the field B^a . Indeed, the change $B^a \rightarrow Q^{ab}B^b + H^{ab}F^b$ with Q, H appropriately chosen eliminates the term quadratic in the curvature and brings the term B^aF^b into its canonical form. The other potential terms of concern are the ones containing four and two covariant derivatives of Ψ , e.g.

$$\Psi^{a_1 a_2} (d_A \Psi)^{a_1 a_2} (d_A \Psi)^{a_2 a_3} (d_A \Psi)^{a_3 a_4} (d_A \Psi)^{a_4 a_1}, \quad (8)$$

$$f^{abc} \Psi^{ba_1} (d_A \Psi)^{a_1 a_2} (d_A \Psi)^{a_2 c} F^a, \quad (9)$$

as well as terms similar to the last one with F^a replaced by B^a . Divergences of this type, if exist, would make the above argument somewhat less convincing. We claim that no such terms arise in the theory under investigation (see more on this below). One can also worry about the appearance of counterterms dependent on the background metric and required to fix the various gauge symmetries present in (2). Such terms may be present if the BRST algebra one uses in the gauge-fixing procedure is metric dependent. Again, to show that this is not the case one has to resort to a detailed analysis.

Let us now briefly describe the main points of the analysis we have performed. To avoid dealing with the field

B^a redefinitions as described above, we decided to introduce a background only for the gauge field A (and of course the curvature field Ψ) but not B . There is no loss of generality in this, as both the original action (2) and the renormalized action with all the counterterms are quadratic in B^a . The 2-form field can therefore be integrated out. Thus, we are led to consider Einstein’s gravity in the form

$$S[A, \Psi] = \frac{i}{2} \int_M (\Lambda \delta^{ab} + \Psi^{ab})^{-1} F^a F^b, \quad (10)$$

which has also been discussed in e.g. [3]. As before, we would like to treat Ψ as an external non-fluctuating field, and integrate over fluctuations of the gauge field about a chosen (arbitrary) background. In doing this, we would like to treat the first, Ψ -independent term as the kinetic one. However, there is an obvious problem with this, as this kinetic term is topological and independent of the connection A . To circumvent the problem we have followed a trick originally due to Stückelberg [6], also used recently in the context of BF YM theory in [7], which consists in introducing an extra field in the action, in our case a 2-form Lie algebra valued field G , so that the full action acquires the desired (topological) symmetry. Thus, we consider the action (10) with F replaced by $F - G$, which is invariant under $A \rightarrow A + \tau$ (for infinitesimal τ) when G transforms as $G \rightarrow G + d_A \tau$. We can then gauge-fix this symmetry using standard BRST methods. The gauge we have used is the so-called self-dual gauge in which $G_{\mu\nu}^a$ is set to be a self-dual two-form. Our treatment is motivated by works on Donaldson theory, especially [8], see also the review [9]. After fixing the gauge and integrating G out one arrives at the following simple theory:

$$S[A, \Psi] = -\frac{1}{2} \int_M (\Lambda \delta^{ab} + \Psi^{ab})^{-1} (F^+)^{\mu\nu a} (F^+)^a_{\mu\nu}, \quad (11)$$

plus a certain set of ghost terms, essentially the same as those present in the Donaldson theory; details will appear elsewhere. The only important point for purposes of this letter is that the gauge-fixed BRST algebra is independent of the background metric introduced for fixing the gauge. This guarantees independence of the correlation functions of the theory from the metric, see [10] for a detailed argument to this effect.

Before we describe results of our perturbative analysis of (11) a word of caution is in order. The equivalence of the physical content of the theory (11) and the theory (10) may be questioned, similarly to who one can question the equivalence of Donaldson theory $(F^+)^a(F^+)^a$ that restricts one to the moduli space of YM instantons, and a rather trivial theory $F^a F^a$. The available derivations of one theory from the other by a “gauge-fixing” procedure are only “metaphorical”. The same can be said about the relation between the two theories (10) and

(11). It is because of this delicate point that we cannot immediately extend the results on (11) to the theory (10). Further work comparing the physics of both theories is necessary.

To understand (11) perturbatively we use the background field method. The Feynman rules for the Ψ -independent sector are the usual ones for YM theory in the background field. The interaction vertices of the Ψ -sector are not much more complicated; because of the lack of space we will only describe here the basic vertex of the type Ψaa , where a is the fluctuation of the gauge field. This vertex is proportional to the function $N_{\mu\nu}(p, q) = (p \cdot q)g_{\mu\nu} - q_\nu p_\mu + i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}p_\rho q_\sigma$, which satisfies an important projector-like property

$$\frac{1}{p_2^2} N_{\mu_1\mu_2}(p_1, p_2) N_{\mu_2\mu_3}(p_2, p_3) = N_{\mu_1\mu_3}(p_1, p_3), \quad (12)$$

making computations at any order in Ψ manageable.

The results of perturbative (one-loop) computations for the theory (11) can be summarized as follows. First, there are no divergences that would require counterterms containing derivatives of Ψ . Together with the metric-independence of the BRST algebra this implies that all counterterms are of type (4) containing higher powers of Ψ . This means that the theory (11) is renormalizable by the usual multiplicative renormalization of the gauge-field coupling constant g and by redefinition of the field Ψ . Our claim of renormalizability properties of quantum gravity (6) follows from this renormalizability of (11), see however our cautionary remarks above. Using the theory (11) we have also computed the beta-function for the lowest order coupling in the expansion of $\phi(\Phi)$ in powers of Φ . We have found a negative beta-function, indicating that this coupling becomes important in the infra-red.

Let us conclude with a brief discussion of the main results. We have shown that the non-metric generalization (6) of Einstein's GR "gauge-fixed" in a particular way (11) described above is one-loop renormalizable in the sense that the renormalization group flow acts in the space of functions of two complex variables. It remains to extend the results obtained to arbitrary number of loops, as well as clarify the physical meaning of the "gauge-fixing" we have used. It is also very important to find a more direct, symmetry based argument that would show

that no counterterms containing derivatives of Ψ get generated. The renormalizability we established is not of the usual multiplicative type - we had to invoke both multiplicative renormalization as well as field redefinitions. It is also not of the usual type as there still remains a large ambiguity in the theory - the function $\phi(\Phi)$ is undetermined, and is to be fixed by experiment or some other principle. The UV completion of the theory may be provided by the asymptotic safety scenario, provided a non-trivial UV fixed point $\phi_{UV}(\Phi)$ exists.

Let us compare the theory we considered with renormalizable, asymptotically-free theories of quantum gravity proposed in the literature, e.g. [11]. These theories are similar to the one described here in that higher powers of the curvature play the key role. Unlike all previous proposals, the theory discussed contains no higher derivatives and is thus free from ghosts.

In this paper the effect of quantum gravitational corrections was argued to be in appearance in the renormalized action (6) of a term playing the role of a curvature dependent cosmological "constant". This interpretation of the quantum corrected gravity action may shed new light on the cosmological constant problem.

-
- [1] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B311**, 46 (1988).
 - [2] J. Plebanski, Journ. Math. Phys. **18**, 2511 (1977).
 - [3] R. Capovilla, T. Jacobson, J. Dell, and L. Mason, Class. Quant. Grav. **8**, 41 (1991).
 - [4] S. Weinberg, in Hawking, S.W., Israel, W.: General Relativity, 790-831.
 - [5] M. Niedermaier, arXiv:gr-qc/0610018.
 - [6] E. C. G. Stückelberg, Helv. Phys. Acta. **11**, 226, 229 (1938).
 - [7] A. S. Cattaneo, P. Cotta-Ramusino, F. Fucito, M. Martellini, M. Rinaldi, A. Tanzini and M. Zeni, Commun. Math. Phys. **197**, 571 (1998).
 - [8] J. M. F. Labastida and M. Pernici, Phys. Lett. B **212**, 56 (1988).
 - [9] D. Birmingham, M. Blau, M. Rakowski, and G. Thompson, Phys. Rept. **209**, 129 (1991).
 - [10] M. Blau and G. Thompson, Phys. Lett. **B255**, 535 (1991).
 - [11] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. **B104**, 377 (1981).